



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/753,860

01/07/2004

Craig D. Cuttner

12510/31

6021

7590
KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

07/08/2008

EXAMINER

HONG, HYUN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/753,860	Applicant(s) CUTTNER ET AL.	
	Examiner Hyun J. Hong	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-24 and 26-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-24, 26-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 20, 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4-8, 12, 17, 24, 26, 29, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of McElhatten (US 2003/0208763).

Regarding claim 1, Ellis discloses A method for displaying a media guide to a user, comprising:

receiving information regarding media programs which include: i) programs that are immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0043] via internet), and iii) programs that are immediately available to the user via television

broadcast (via cable link [0043]), the information including titles of the media programs; and ([0006] Television broadcasts are comprised of streaming data.)

list of recommended titles (fig. 16b)

However, Ellis does not specifically disclose receiving information regarding ii) programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, displaying in a single integrated list of titles at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming, a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and a title of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast.

In analogous art, McElhatten discloses receiving information regarding ii) programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user ([0123]), displaying in a single integrated list of titles at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0122], fig. 1 *Past programs may be downloaded*), a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user ([0123], fig. 1), and a title of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast (fig. 20a *Programs that are currently being played are immediately available*).

It would have been obvious to combine the single integrated list of McElhatten into the program guide of Ellis. This provides the user with a more comprehensive program guide that informs the user of recorded programs in addition to other programs.

Regarding claim 4, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, wherein available to the user via television broadcast include programs that are available to the user via at least one of: i) satellite broadcast, and ii) cable broadcast ([0006] “cable system headends” “satellite TV distribution”).

Regarding claim 5, Ellis discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein the information includes data which describes content of the media programs, and wherein the method further comprises: comparing the data that describes the content of the media programs to data that describes user preferences, wherein the displaying step includes displaying the titles based on a result of the comparison ([0095]).

Regarding claim 6, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 5, further comprising: receiving the user preferences expressly from the user ([0085]).

Regarding claim 7, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 6, further comprising: determining the user preferences based on a viewing history of the user ([0010]).

Regarding claim 8, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 6, wherein the displaying step includes displaying titles of media programs that do not meet the user preferences and that meet a promotional priority of a service provider (fig 6 “selectable advertisement, [0066]).

Regarding claim 12, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, wherein the media programs further include media programs that are available to the user in the future (fig. 7 *Future times are listed on the media guide*).

Regarding claim 17, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, providing a media program via one of download and data streaming ([0006]).

Regarding claim 24, Ellis in view of McElhatten discloses a system, comprising:

A processor (42 of Ellis control circuitry);

At least one arrangement configured to communicate with the processor via a communications network (fig. 2b, fig. 4 of Ellis);

A computer-readable storing medium (memory 63, [0062] of Ellis) storing a set of instructions, the set of instructions capable of being executed by the processor to implement a method for displaying a media guide to a user, the set of instructions performing the steps of:

receiving information regarding media programs which include: i) programs that are immediately available to the user via download or data streaming ([0043] of Ellis via internet), ii) programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user ([0123] of McElhatten), and iii) programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast (via cable link [0043] of Ellis), the information including titles of the media programs; and ([0006] of Ellis Television broadcasts are comprised of streaming data.)

displaying, in a single integrated list of recommended titles, at least some of the titles, the at least some of the titles including a title of at least one of the programs immediately available to the user via download or data streaming, a title of at least one of the programs that have been previously stored locally relative to the user, and a title

of at least one of the programs that are immediately available to the user via television broadcast ([0122, 0123] of McElhatten).

Regarding claim 26, see the rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claim 29, see the rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 34, Ellis in view of McElhatten discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein all of the programs whose titles are included in the single integrated list of recommended titles are selected for inclusion of their titles in the single integrated list in accordance with at least one of promotional priorities, user program preferences, and user program experience history (fig. 16a-b of Ellis).

Regarding claim 35, see the rejection of claim 34.

Claims 3, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of McElhatten (US 2003/0208763) as applied to claim 1 and claim 24 respectively, further in view of Russ (US 2004/0060063).

Regarding claim 3, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Russ discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the locally stored media programs include programs that are stored on a personal video recorder (fig. 12 of Russ).

Regarding claim 16, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Russ discloses The method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, recording a television broadcast (fig. 5).

Claims 9, 10, 11, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of McElhatten (US 2003/0208763) as applied to claim 1 and claim 24 respectively, further in view of Colsey (US 2003/005429).

Regarding claim 9, Ellis in view of McElhatten discloses the method according to claim 1.

However, Ellis in view of McElhatten does not teach the method of claim 1 further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying a preview of a media program associated with the selected title.

In analogous art, Colsey discloses in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying a preview of a media program associated with the selected title ([0026]).

It would have been obvious to combine the previews of Colsey into the media guide of Ellis in view of McElhatten. This would allow users to quickly determine whether they want to watch a specific program.

Regarding claim 10, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Colsey discloses The method according to claim 9, further comprising: generating the preview based on flags transmitted from a central facility ([0026] of Colsey) *The preview is stored and released by the EPG server.*

Regarding claim 11, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Colsey discloses The method according to claim 9, further comprising: receiving the preview with the media program associated with the selected title ([0026] of Colsey).

Regarding claim 27, see the rejection of claim 9.

Claims 13, 14, 15, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of McElhatten (US 2003/0208763) as applied to claim 1 and claim 24 respectively, further in view of Needham (US 2003/0177495).

Regarding claim 13, Ellis in view of McElhatten discloses the method according to claim 1.

However, Ellis in view of McElhatten does not disclose wherein the titles are displayed with a graphical indication of availability of the media programs.

In analogous art, Needham discloses wherein the titles are displayed with a graphical indication of availability of the media programs ([0025] “colors, icons”).

It would have been obvious to combine the graphical indication of Needham into the media guide of Ellis in view of McElhatten. This makes it easier for the user to see the programs that are unavailable/available.

Regarding claim 14, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Needham discloses The method according to claim 13, wherein the graphical indication includes at least one of color shading and an icon ([0025] of Needham).

Regarding claim 15, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Needham discloses The method according to claim 13, wherein the media programs include media programs that are available to the user in the future and programs that are stored

locally, and wherein the graphical indication describes whether the media programs are one of immediately available for download or data streaming, immediately available via television broadcast, stored locally, and available in the future ([0025] of Needham).

Regarding claim 28, see the rejection of claim 14.

Claims 18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US 2003/0146940) in view of McElhatten (US 2003/0208763) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Schein (US 2003/0005445).

Regarding claim 18, Ellis in view of McElhatten discloses the method according to claim 1.

However, Ellis in view of McElhatten does not disclose the method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying information related to the selected media program, the information includes at least one of actor data, director data and genre data.

In analogous art, Schein discloses the method according to claim 1, further comprising: in response to the user selecting one of the titles of the media programs, displaying information related to the selected media program, the information includes at least one of actor data, director data and genre data (fig. 18E).

It would have been obvious to combine the actor data of Shein into the media guide of Ellis in view of McElhatten. This enables the user to find out information about his favorite programs.

Regarding claim 19, Ellis in view of McElhatten in view of Schein discloses The method according to claim 1, further comprising: prompting the user to at least one of pay a cost and wait a time period before viewing a media program (fig. 18c of Schein).

Claims 20-23, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks (US 6,515,680) in view of Ellis (US 2003/0146940) further in view of Dunn (US 5,945,987)

Regarding claim 20, Hendricks discloses a method of displaying a program guide to a user, comprising:

a) receiving information from a programming provider that indicates suggested media programs (fig. 16-17)

c) displaying, in a first list, titles of at least some of the suggested media programs (fig. 16-17)

However, Hendricks does not specifically disclose b) receiving express user references from the user; d) displaying in a second list, titles of at least some media programs that are immediately available to the user and that meet at least one of the user preferences.

In analogous art, Ellis discloses b) receiving express user references from the user ([0085]); d) displaying in a second list, titles of at least some media programs that are immediately available to the user and that meet at least one of the user preferences (fig. 16a, [0095]),

It would have been obvious to combine the user preference system of Ellis into the program guide of Hendricks. This would allow the provider to customize the EPG according to the user's preferences.

However, Hendricks in view of Ellis does not disclose displaying a first and second list on a single page, a separation of the first and second lists being demarcated.

Dunn discloses displaying a first and second list on a single page, a separation of the first and second lists being demarcated (fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to combine the single page/multiple lists of Dunn into the program guide of Hendricks in view of Ellis. This would allow the provider to present their promotional programs while the user is perusing his preferred programs.

Regarding claim 21, Ellis discloses The method according to claim 20, further comprising: receiving metadata associated with at least some media programs, the metadata including information that describes the media programs, wherein step d) includes comparing the metadata to the express user preferences, and displaying titles of media programs based on the comparison ([0095] of Ellis).

Regarding claim 22, see claim 8.

Regarding claim 23, Hendricks in view of Ellis in view of Dunn discloses A method of displaying a program guide to a user, comprising:

receiving user preferences ([0085] of Ellis);

receiving an indication of a priority of a programming provider (fig. 16-17 of Hendricks);

receiving respective metadata associated with available media programs;
comparing the user preferences to the metadata ([0094] of Ellis); and

displaying on a single page (fig. 5 of Dunn) and in a first list, a first title of at least one of the available media programs if the respective metadata associated with the at least one of the available media programs matches at least one of the user preferences ([0094] of Ellis); and

displaying on a single page (fig. 5 of Dunn) and in a first list, a second title of at least another of the available media programs based on the priority of the programming provider, even if the respective metadata associated with the at least another of the available media programs does not match at least one of the user preferences (fig. 16-17 of Hendricks).

Regarding claim 30, see the rejection of claim 20.

Regarding claim 31, see the rejection of claim 21.

Regarding claim 32, see the rejection of claim 8.

Regarding claim 33, see the rejection of claim 23.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hyun J. Hong whose telephone number is (571)270-1553. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30a-7:00p).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571)272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/H. J. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2623

/Vivek Srivastava/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623